

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF WEST VIRGINIA
AT BLUEFIELD

OMAR ANTHONY GREEN,

Petitioner,

v.

CIVIL ACTION NO: 1:14-31194

BART MASTERS, Warden,
FCI McDowell

Respondent.

MEMORANDUM OPINION AND ORDER

Pending before the court is petitioner's petition for a writ of habeas corpus pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 2241. ECF No. 1. By Standing Order, the matter was referred to United States Magistrate Judge Dwane L. Tinsley for submission of proposed findings and recommendations ("PF&R") for disposition pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)(B). On December 13, 2017, the magistrate judge submitted his PF&R, in which he recommended that the district court deny as moot petitioner's petition, and dismiss the matter from the court's docket. ECF No. 12.

In accordance with the provisions of 28 U.S.C. § 636(b), petitioner was allotted fourteen days, plus three mailing days, in which to file any objections to Magistrate Judge Tinsley's Findings and Recommendation. The failure to file such objections constitutes a waiver of the right to a de novo review

by this court. Snyder v. Ridenour, 889 F.2d 1363 (4th Cir. 1989).

Petitioner failed to file any objections to the magistrate judge's Findings and Recommendation within the seventeen-day period. Having reviewed the Findings and Recommendation, the court **ADOPTS** the factual and legal analysis contained with the PF&R, (ECF No. 12), **DISMISSES** the petition as moot, (ECF No. 1), and **DIRECTS** the Clerk to remove this case from the court's docket.

Additionally, the court has considered whether to grant a certificate of appealability. See 28 U.S.C. § 2253(c). A certificate will not be granted unless there is "a substantial showing of the denial of a constitutional right." 28 U.S.C. § 2253(c)(2). The standard is satisfied only upon a showing that reasonable jurists would find that any assessment of the constitutional claims by this court is debatable or wrong and that any dispositive procedural ruling is likewise debatable. Miller-El v. Cockrell, 537 U.S. 322, 336-38 (2003); Slack v. McDaniel, 529 U.S. 473, 484 (2000); Rose v. Lee, 252 F.3d 676, 683-84 (4th Cir. 2001). The court concludes that the governing standard is not satisfied in this instance. Accordingly, the court **DENIES** a certificate of appealability.

The Clerk is directed to forward a copy of this Memorandum
Opinion and Order to petitioner, pro se.

IT IS SO ORDERED this 1st day of February, 2018.

ENTER:

David A. Faber

David A. Faber
Senior United States District Judge